



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/688,742

10/17/2003

Yixin Diao

YOR920030504US1

2816

7590 06/25/2008
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

ZHE, MENG YAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2195

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/688,742	Applicant(s) DIAO ET AL.	
	Examiner MENG YAO ZHE	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9, 12-13, 15-22, 24, 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott et al., Patent No. 6,314,463 (hereafter Abbott) in view of Williams et al., Patent No. 5,845,283 (hereafter Williams).

4. Abbott and Williams are cited in the previous office action.

5. As per claims 1, 17, 27, 28, Abbott teaches a method of generically controlling one or more resources associated with at least one computing system, comprising the steps of:

evaluating one or more generically-expressed performance metrics associated with the one or more resources given one or more generically-expressed configurations of the one or more resources (Abstract, lines 1-6; Column 6, lines 66-Column 7, line 5; Column 11, lines 13-20, lines 45-60);

causing a change in the one or more generically-expressed configurations of the one or more resources based on the performance metric evaluating step (Column 14, lines 49-54; Column 7, lines 39-64);

updating the one or more resources with the one or more resource specific configurations (Column 17, lines 50-54).

Abbott does not specifically teach translating one or more performance metrics and one or more configurations from an associated resource specific format to a generic format such that each of the one or more resources are generically controlled, wherein a generic format comprises a common format and generically controlling the one or more resources comprises controlling the one or more resources in accordance with the common format, translating the one or more changed configurations from the generic format to the associated resource specific format and wherein the one or more configurations of the one or more resources are optimized in a closed loop system formed via a combination of the first translating, evaluating, change causing, second translating and updating steps.

However Williams teaches a conversion engine that can translate one or more performance metrics and one or more configurations from an associated resource specific format to a generic format such that each of the one or more resources are generically controlled wherein a generic format comprises a common format and generically controlling the one or more resources comprises controlling the one or more resources in accordance with the common format and translate the one or more

changed configurations from the generic format to the associated resource specific format for the purpose of communication among systems that each uses a different communication format (Abstract; Column 2, lines 17-19, lines 45-53; Column 6, lines 1-6; Column 8, lines 32-36: the UDF corresponds to the generic format and the common format).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Abbott, where resource managers and resources have the ability to communicate amongst one another and resources managers have the ability to make performance optimization and configuration decisions based on metrics sent to it from the resources themselves, with in the specific instance where the resources and the manager each uses a different communication protocol or format, a conversion engine may be used to translate one or more performance metrics and one or more configurations from an associated resource specific format to a generic format such that each of the one or more resources are generically controlled wherein a generic format comprises a common format and generically controlling the one or more resources comprises controlling the one or more resources in accordance with the common format and translating the one or more changed configurations from the generic format to the associated resource specific format, as taught by Williams, such that a closed loop system is formed so that there may be translating, evaluating, change causing, second translating, and updating, because it allows communication among systems that each uses a different communication format.

6. As per claims 2, 18, Abbott teaches wherein the one or more resources are at least one of real resources and virtual resources (Abstract, lines 1-3).

7. As per claims 3, 19, Abbott teaches wherein the step of evaluating the one or more generically-expressed performance metrics further comprises determining whether one or more performance goals are being met based on the one or more generically-expressed performance metrics (Column 3, lines 4-10; Column 17, lines 65-67).

8. As per claims 4, 20, Abbott teaches the step of obtaining the one or more generically-expressed performance metrics from a probe (Column 11, lines 45-47).

9. As per claim 5, Abbott teaches wherein the probe measures performance of the one or more resources in the context of a particular workload (Column 11, lines 46-54).

10. As per claim 6, Abbott teaches wherein the particular workload is a current workload (Column 11, lines 46-50).

11. As per claims 7, 21, Abbott in view of Williams does not specifically teach the step of obtaining the one or more generically-expressed performance metrics via one or more measurements of at least a part of an end user performance experience.

However , it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have a user give feedback and forming part of the performance metric because to maintain quality of service (QoS), user feedback is important.

12. As per claims 8, 22, Abbott teaches further comprising the step of obtaining the one or more generically-expressed configurations associated with the one or more resources prior to changing a configuration (Column 17, lines 22-27, lines 50-54).

13. As per claim 9, Abbott teaches the step of categorizing the one or more obtained, generically-expressed configurations (Tables 1-2 in columns 11-12).

14. As per claim 12, Abbott teaches wherein the model building step further comprises obtaining performance samples associated with the one or more resources and their one or more current configurations (Column 11, lines 13-17, 46-55).

Art Unit: 2195

15. As per claims 13, 24, Abbott teaches wherein the step of causing a change in the one or more generically-expressed configurations further comprises instructing the one or more resources to change one or more configurations associated therewith (Column 17, lines 50-54).

16. As per claims 15, 26, Williams teaches wherein the one or more performance metrics and the one or more configurations are expressed in generic formats in accordance with one or more common generic interfaces (Column 6, lines 1-6).

17. As per claim 16, Williams teaches wherein a common generic interface comprises a Common Interface Model (Column 6, lines 1-6).

18. Claims 10, 11, 14, 23, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott et al., Patent No. 6,314,463 (hereafter Abbott) in view of Williams et al., Patent No. 5,845,283 (hereafter Williams) further in view of Freund, Patent No. 6,076,174 (hereafter Freund).

19. Freund was cited in the last office action.

20. As per claims 10, 23, Abbott in view of Williams does not specifically teach wherein the step of causing a change in the one or more generically-expressed

configurations further comprises building a model for use in determining changes in the one or more generically-expressed configurations.

However, Freund teaches wherein the step of causing a change in the one or more generically-expressed configurations further comprises building a model for use in determining changes in the one or more generically-expressed configurations for the purpose of helping to better determine and fine tune resource allocation schedules (Column 3, lines 38-48; Column 4, lines 1-7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Abbott in view of Williams with the step of causing a change in the one or more generically-expressed configurations further comprises building a model for use in determining changes in the one or more generically-expressed configurations, as taught by Freund, because it helps to better determine and fine tune resource allocation schedules.

21. As per claim 11, Freund teaches wherein the model building step comprises using at least one of a previous performance history and a previous configuration (Column 3, lines 22-33; Column 4, lines 8-15; Column 5, lines 20-26).

22. As per claims 14, 25, Freund teaches the step of storing the one or more changed, generically-expressed configurations (Column 3, lines 7-9, lines 21-28).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/11/2008 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

In the remark, the applicant argued that:

- i) Abbott in view of Williams does not teach a closed loop system.

The Examiner respectfully disagree with the applicant. As to point:

- i) The applicant merely defined a closed loop system as being formed by translating, evaluating, change causing, second translating and updating steps. Abbott teaches the evaluating, change causing and updating steps (Column 14, lines 49-54; Column 7, lines 39-64; please see claim 1 rejection). Williams teaches the first and second translating steps, specifically translating back and forth between specific formats to universal formats (Abstract). Therefore, when the two teachings are combined, a closed loop system results.

The applicant further goes on to say there is no motivation to combine the two teachings because they each deal with disparate problems. The Examiner notes that these two references are needed partly due to the fact that the claim itself deals with two different problems to begin with. The applicant presented two different problems in all independent claims, one being controlling resources, the other being translating different formats. Therefore, the Examiner presented

Abbott who deals with resource allocation, and combined it with Williams who deals with translating different formats, so that in the event that any resource allocation messages are written in different formats, one may use William's invention to translate among formats.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MENGYAO ZHE whose telephone number is (571)272-6946. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Friday, 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/688,742
Art Unit: 2195

Page 11

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195